



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,495	05/10/2005	Andrew C. Lewin	124-1118	4506
23117	7590	01/27/2009	EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC			PUTNOOSE, ROY M	
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			2886	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/27/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/534,495	LEWIN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ROY PUNNOOSE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2886	
<b>All Participants:</b>		<b>Status of Application:</b> <i>Reply pending to Applicant's Response.</i>	
(1) ROY PUNNOOSE.		(3) Atty. Stanley C. Spooner (Reg. No. 27,393).	
(2) SPE Tarifur Chowdhury.		(4) _____.	
<b>Date of Interview:</b> <u>12 January 2009</u>		<b>Time:</b> <u>10:00 AM</u>	
<b>Type of Interview:</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)			
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.			
<b>Part I.</b>			
Rejection(s) discussed: <i>Prior art Tiao et al (U. S. Patent 6,318,863) over claim 1</i>			
Claims discussed: <i>Claim 1</i>			
Prior art documents discussed: <i>Tiao et al (U. S. Patent 6,318,863)</i>			
<b>Part II.</b>			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: <i>See Continuation Sheet</i>			
<b>Part III.</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.			
<i>/ROY M. PUNNOOSE/          Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2886</i>			
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)			

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

On Thursday, 08 January 2009 the Examiner indicated to SPE T. Chowdhury that prior art Tiao et al (U. S. Patent 6,318,863) read on several claims of the instant application, primarily claim 1. In the interest of expediency SPE Chowdhury telephoned Atty. Spooner to discuss the Examiner's finding. Atty. Spooner stated that he will call back on Monday, 12 January 2009 after discussing the matter with the inventors.

In the interview on Monday, 12 January 2009, Atty. Spooner argued that claim 1 has allowable subject matter because prior art Tiao et al (U.S Patent 6,318,863) does not teach the following:

- 1.A "structured light generator" for illuminating a scene (as in the preamble of claim 1);
- 2.The "projection optics arranged together with said light source and said light guide" so as to project an array of distinct images of the light source towards the scene; and,
- 3.A "projection lens" for projecting light to a scene (compared to prior art using a condenser lens for projecting light to a scene).

In response to Atty. Spooner's arguments, the Examiner and SPE Chowdhury contended that the prior art uses the principles of kaleidoscope which is the same principle that is used in applicant's claimed invention. The Examiner and SPE Chowdhury further contended that all the elements, the light source, the light guide and the projection lens as claimed in claim 1 of the instant application are clearly taught by prior art Tiao et al, specifically in col.10, line 65 - col.11, line 15, and Figure 11.

No agreement was reached. At the conclusion of the interview SPE Chowdhury indicated to Atty. Spooner that the Office's position will be conveyed to the applicant via an office action.